

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

David Sutherland, ) C/A No. 2:21-cv-03975-DCC  
                          )  
                          )  
Plaintiff, )  
                          )  
                          )  
v. ) **ORDER**  
                          )  
                          )  
Commissioner of Social Security )  
Administration, )  
                          )  
                          )  
Defendant. )  
                          )  
\_\_\_\_\_

Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) seeking judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying his claims for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for pre-trial handling. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) on October 26, 2022, recommending that the Court reverse the decision of the Commissioner and remand for further proceedings. ECF No. 14. Neither party filed objections to the Report.<sup>1</sup>

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of only those portions of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Commissioner filed a Reply to the Magistrate Judge’s Report, indicating the Social Security Administration does not intend to file any objections. ECF No. 15.

Report that have been specifically objected to, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” (citation omitted)).

Upon review of the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and **ADOPTS** the Report. Therefore, the Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED** and the Court **REMANDS** this matter to the Commissioner pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

November 17, 2022  
Spartanburg, South Carolina